

JOHANNES BRONKHORST

## Yoga and seśvara Sāṁkhya

(Published in: *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 9 (1981), pp. 309-320)

The expressions “Yoga” and *seśvara sāmkhya* (“Sāṁkhya with God”) are now commonly used to refer to a system of Indian philosophy also known by the name “Patañjali’s philosophy” (*pātañjala darśana*), which has found its classic exposition in the *Yogabhāṣya* and the commentaries on that work.

The aim of this article is to show that until a rather late date “Yoga” and *seśvara sāmkhya* did not refer to Patañjali’s philosophy. The evidence at our disposal strongly suggests that before this date “Yoga”, where it referred to a system of philosophy, referred to Nyāya and/or Vaiśeṣika. The expression *seśvara sāmkhya* may have referred to the Pāñcarātra system.

## YOGA

The first clear use of the word “Yoga” referring to Patañjali’s philosophy occurs, as far as I know, in Śaṅkara’s Bhāṣya to *Brahmasūtra* 2.1.3. There Śaṅkara maintains that “by the rejection of the Sāṁkhya tradition (*smṛti*) also the Yoga tradition has been rejected” (p. 143, l. 10: ... *sāmkhya smṛtipratyākhyānena yogasmṛtir api pratyākhyātā* ...). What is meant by “Yoga” can be learned from the following sentence: “There (i.e., in Yoga) too, in contradiction with the Sacred Tradition (*śruti*), the fundamental substrative cause (*pradhāna*) [is considered] a fully independent cause, and *mahat* etc. are considered effects [even though] unknown in the world and the Veda” (p. 143, l. 11-12: *tatrāpi śrutivirodhena pradhānam svataṁtram eva kāraṇam, mahadādīni ca kāryāṇy alokavedaprasiddhāni kalpyante*). The fact that Śaṅkara appears to have written a commentary on the *Yogabhāṣya* (Hacker, 1968/69; Vetter, 1979: 22) further confirms that the philosophy embodied in that work is here meant.<sup>1</sup>

The *Yogabhāṣya* calls itself “Patañjali’s authoritative book on Yoga, *expository of Sāṁkhya*” (*pātañjala sāmkhya pravacana yogaśāstra*; see Jacobi, 1929: 584 (685); Woods, 1914, 1914: 100, 347). Apparently the philosophical system propounded is said to be

<sup>1</sup> Note that the passage quoted from the *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* implies that in Patañjali’s philosophy God (*īśvara*) plays no role in the creation of the world. (Rāmānuja (12<sup>th</sup> cent.), contrary to Śaṅkara, points out — while commenting in his *Śrībhāṣya* on *Brahmasūtra* 2.1.3 — that the Yoga tradition is rejected “because it accepts God merely as an efficient cause” (p. 561, l. 1-2: *nimittakāraṇamātreśvarābhyupagamāt*.) In his *Pātañjalayogaśāstravivaraṇa* (p. 58 f.), on the other hand, Śaṅkara gives proofs that God created the world. This latter view may be meant in the Bhāṣya to *Brahmasūtra* 2.2.37, where we read (p. 206, l. 17-18): *kecit tāvat sāmkhya yogyavyapāśrayāḥ kalpayanti pradhānapuruṣayor adhiṣṭhātā kevalam nimittakāraṇam īśvaraḥ / itaretaravilakṣaṇāḥ pradhānapuruṣeśvarā itī* /. If this is correct, the compound *sāmkhya yoga* must be understood to mean “the Yoga which is [a form of] Sāṁkhya” (cf. *kāpilayogin* in note 8 below), so that the whole becomes: “Some indeed who rely on the Yoga which is [a form of] Sāṁkhya, think that God is superintending both the fundamental substrative cause (*pradhāna*) and the Selves (*puruṣa*), [and is] the isolated efficient cause. [They further think that] the fundamental substrative cause, the Selves, and God are different from each other.”

Sāṁkhya. “Yoga” here refers to the spiritual discipline, which is free from, or at least adjustable to, philosophical views. [310] This is the sense which the word “Yoga” has in the majority of its occurrences in the earlier literature. Even as late a work as Sāyaṇamādhava’s *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* uses the word almost exclusively in this sense.<sup>2</sup> (The Jainas use the word “Yoga” quite differently; see Williams, 1963, and below.)

There is a number of probably pre-Śāṅkara occurrences of “Yoga” where this word seems to refer to a philosophical school. Most of these occurrences are in contexts which do not enable us to decide which school of philosophy is meant. In one case (*Nyāyabhāṣya* to sūtra 1.1.29; see below), however, the word “Yoga” points quite clearly to Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika, not to our “Yoga system”. That “Yoga” can refer to Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika is also known from a number of Jaina texts (Chaṭṭopādhyāya, 1927: 856-57; Thomas, 1960: 7 n. 1, 57 n. 1). It must further be observed that, in the passages which are about to study, Yoga is never enumerated together with Nyāya and/or Vaiśeṣika.<sup>3</sup> Nothing therefore prevents us from assuming that “Yoga” in these passages refers to Nyāya and/or Vaiśeṣika.

The pre-Śāṅkara passages of which I am aware and which contain the word “Yoga” apparently referring to a system of philosophy, are the following:

- (i) *Nyāyasūtra* 1.1.29 defines the “settled doctrine restricted to a system of philosophy” (*pratitantrasiddhānta*) as “established in the same system of philosophy, [but] not established in other systems of philosophy” (p. 49: *samānatrantrasiddhaḥ paratantrāsiddhaḥ pratitantrasiddhāntaḥ*). Vātsyāyana, in his *Bhāṣya*, gives two illustrations, of which the second is of interest to us (p. 49):

*yathā ... puruṣakarmanimitto bhūtasargaḥ karmahetavo doṣāḥ pravṛttiś ca svagunaḥ śiṣṭāś cetanāḥ asad utpadyate utpannam nirudhyata iti yogānām*

“For example, [a settled doctrine restricted] to the Yogas is the following: the creation of the world is caused by the *karman* of people; the causes of *karman* are faults and activity; conscious [souls] are distinguished by their attributes; the non-existent comes into being; what has come into being ceases to exist.”

It has repeatedly be observed (Chaṭṭopādhyāya, 1927: 854-55) that the Yogas mentioned in this passage must be the Naiyāyikas and/or Vaiśeṣikas, not the followers of Patañjali’s philosophy; Vātsyāyana’s description fits the former but not the latter.

[311]

- (ii) Kauṭilya’s *Arthaśāstra* 1.2.10 reads (p. 4): *sāṁkhyam yogo lokāyataṃ cety ānvikṣikī*. This sentence must be understood to say — as Hacker (1958: 82) has pointed out — that *ānvikṣikī* “logical thinking” can be found primarily in the three systems Sāṁkhya, Yoga and Lokāyata. It goes without saying that if Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika existed when this sentence was

<sup>2</sup> The only exception is where a reference is made to Śāṅkara’s passage quoted above; see p. 394, l. 73.

<sup>3</sup> One exception will be discussed under point (vi) below.

written, they would belong in the list. It is therefore wise to assume that they — or one of them — are represented by the word “Yoga”,<sup>4</sup> rather than that our “Yoga system” is meant.

One might try to avoid this conclusion by assuming that the *Arthaśāstra* was written in a time when Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika had not yet found recognition (so Jacobi, 1911: 736 (551), 743 (558)), and besides Sāṁkhya only Lokāyata and the “Yoga system” were philosophies worth the name. This point of view is untenable, for the following threefold reason: (1) Trautmann (1971) has given strong arguments that the *Arthaśāstra* is a composite work, of which at least some chapters must have been written in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century A.D. (p. 174 ff.). (2) The Vaiśeṣika system is older than the 2<sup>nd</sup> century A.D. It is referred to in such old works as the *Abhidharma-mahā-vibhāṣā-śāstra*, *Vibhāṣā-śāstra*, and *Caraka-saṁhitā*, which may belong to the 1<sup>st</sup> century A.D. (Ui, 1917: 38-40). (3) None of the old enumerations of schools of philosophy mentions our “Yoga system”; see below.

(iii) We know that Śāṅkara uses the word “Yoga” in order to refer to Patañjali’s philosophy in his commentary on *Brahmasūtra* 2.1.3. Let us at this sūtra itself in its context. Sūtras 2.1.1-4 read:

(1) *smṛtyanavakāśadoṣaprasaṅga iti cen nānyasmṛtyanavakāśadoṣaprasaṅgāt* “If [you object] that there would be the fault of there being no place for traditional knowledge (smṛti) [we answer:] no, because there would be the fault of there being no place for other traditional knowledge.”

(2) *itareṣāṃ cānupalabdheḥ* “And because of the non-perception of the others.”

(3) *etena yogaḥ pratyuktaḥ* “Hereby Yoga has been refuted.”

(4) *na vilakṣaṇatvād asya tathātvaṃ ca śabdāt* “No, because of its being different; and [its] thus-ness [is known] from the Word.”

It is clear from this enumeration that it is virtually impossible to derive from the bare sūtras what is here meant by “Yoga”.<sup>5</sup> What is more, sūtra 4 seems to presuppose a preceding sūtra quite different from sūtra 3. This suggests that Śāṅkara did not have these sūtras in their original order, so that his interpretation of them is doubly suspect.<sup>6</sup> Again, Śāṅkara thinks that the first [312] *smṛti* of sūtra 1 is “the *smṛti* called *tantra*, composed by the great seer, accepted by the cultured, and the other *smṛtis* that are in accord with it” (*smṛtiś ca taṁtrākhyā paramarṣipranītā śiṣṭaparigrhitā, anyaś ca tadanusāriṇyaḥ smṛtayaḥ*; p. 140, l. 15-16), i.e., primarily Sāṁkhya. Only thus can he bring it about that sūtra 3 comes to reject “our” Yoga,

<sup>4</sup> Matilal (1977: 77), while discussing this passage, tells us in a footnote that “[a]ccording to some (who? JB), yoga refers to the dual school of Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika”. In the main text he explains: “The term Yoga does not mean here the Yoga school of Patañjali. It might have meant logic — the science of reasoning (*yukti*).”

<sup>5</sup> Modi (1960: 336-37) proposes an interpretation of *Brahmasūtra* 2.1 (the *Smṛit Pāda*), which does not rest on Śāṅkara’s, or anyone else’s, commentary. In this interpretation Yoga is “Disinterested Action, as means to Mokṣa” (p. 337), as described in the *Bhagavadgītā*.

<sup>6</sup> The text of the *Brahmasūtra* on which Rāmānuja comments differs in a number of points from the text used in Śāṅkara’s *Bhāṣya*. Most important in the present context is that the order of sūtras is reversed in three cases: Making use of the numbering of sūtras which is in accord with Śāṅkara’s commentary, we can say that in Rāmānuja’s text sūtra 2.2.6 comes after 2.2.9; 3.2.4 comes after 3.2.6; 3.3.31 after 3.3.32. Also not Modi’s (1947: 368) remark that the commentators on the *Brahmasūtra* “had even no correct text of the same”.

i.e., Patañjali's philosophy. But almost everywhere else where the word *smṛti* occurs in the sūtras, Śāṅkara considers it to refer to “the Gītā, the *Mahābhārata* or any other similar work but never to the Sāṁkhya” (Modi, 1936: 714). Moreover, “[i]f the term ‘*smṛti*’ meant Sāṁkhya with the Sētrakāra, it could as well have included in its meaning the Yoga” (Modi, 1936: 715), and a separate sūtra for the refutation of Yoga would be superfluous.<sup>7</sup>

The above shows that there is little reason to follow Śāṅkara in thinking that Yoga in *Brahmasūtra* 2.1.3 is Patañjali's philosophy. Another circumstance confirms this: The *Brahmasūtra* criticizes, according to Śāṅkara, the Sāṁkhyas, Vaiśeṣikas, Buddhists, Jainas and Bhāgavatas. It does not, however, mention any of these by name. If Śāṅkara is right, Yoga would be the only system mentioned by name. Clearly another interpretation of “Yoga” than Śāṅkara's is to be preferred.

(iv) The Mīmāṃsaka Kumārila may have lived before Śāṅkara (Kunjunni Raja, 1960: 135-38; Thrasher, 1979: 139, with 118). Well, Kumārila speaks, in his *Tantravārttika* on sūtra 1.3.4 (p. 114, l. 20-24), about “the treatises on *dharma* and *adharma* accepted by Sāṁkhyas, Yogas, Pāñcarātras, Pāśupatas, Śākyas, and Nirgranthas,” which are however “not accepted by those who know the Veda” and “based ... upon arguments seemingly based upon Sense-perception, Inference, Analogy and Apparent Inconsistency” (tr. Jhā, 1924: 165; ... *trayīvidbhir nna parighṛtāni ...*

*pratyakṣānumānopamānārthāpattiprāyayuktimūlopanibaddhāni*

*sāṁkhyayogapāñcarātrapāśupataśākyanirgranthaparighṛtadharmmādharmmanibandhanāni*

...). On sūtra 1.3.12 (p. 169, l. 11) the Vaiśeṣikas are mentioned as being afraid of the Mīmāṃsakas (*mīmāṃsakatrastāḥ śākyavaiśeṣikādayaḥ*). Akṣapāda, the author of the Nyāyasūtra, is mentioned by name on sūtra 1.4.22 (p. 317, l. 21). Kumārila therefore knew the Naiyāyikas and Vaiśeṣikas. The only reason I can think of that they are not in the list on sūtra 1.3.4, is that they are there represented by the term “Yoga”.

(v) Śāṅkara knew the Pāśupatas (Bhāṣya to *Brahmasūtra* 2.2.37; p. 206, l. 19-20), and may therefore have known Kauṇḍinya's *Pañcārthabhāṣya*, which is the classic exposition of this school. The *Pañcārthabhāṣya* on [313] *Pāśupatasūtra* 5.8 ascribes to Sāṁkhya and Yoga the view that “liberated ones are connected with detachment etc. and have reached peace” (p. 115, l. 4-5, 10-11: *asaṅgādiyuktāḥ muktāḥ śāntiṃ prāptāḥ*). On sūtra 1.26 it ascribes to Sāṁkhya, Yoga etc., the view that there is “the state of isolation after abandonment of *kārya* and *karāṇa*, together with power” (p. 45, l. 13-14: *sahaiśvaryeṇa kāryakaraṇatyāgaṃ kṛtvā kaivalyaniṣṭhā*). Both these views would fit most of the philosophical systems of India. The Vaiśeṣika, whose

<sup>7</sup> Bhāskara accuses Śāṅkara of wrongly interpreting the Brahmasūtras — in an introductory verse he says that his commentary is written in order to refute him (i.e. Śāṅkara), “by whom this *śāstra* was explained by displaying his own opinions, and concealing the opinions expressed in the sūtras”: *sūtrābhiprāyasamvṛtyā svābhiprāyaprakāśanāt / vyākhyātāṃ yair idam śāstraṃ vyākhyeyam tannivṛttaye //* — but may not himself have had access to their original, or even pre-Śāṅkara interpretation; see Rüping, 1977: 65-68.

influence is noticeable in the *Pañcārthabhāṣya* (Schultz, 1958: 12-13), is never mentioned in that work, at least not by that name! Is it far-fetched to assume that the word “Yoga” was used for this system?

(vi) The *Lalitavistara* enumerates Yoga in a list which also contains Sāṁkhya and Vaiśeṣika. This happens where it describes (p. 108) the many respects in which the young Bodhisattva excelled. Towards the end of this long list are mentioned: Sāṁkhya, Yoga, the rules for sacrificial acts (*kriyākālpa*), the art of harlots (*vaiśika*), Vaiśeṣika.

This small part of the list suffices to show that the list is a hotchpotch of names of the most varied skills. There is therefore no compelling reason to think that “Yoga” refers to a system of philosophy. Its use immediately after “Sāṁkhya” may be compared to the *Mahābhārata*, where the two terms often occur together, but where “Yoga” never refers to a system of philosophy. See below.

Note that the list of 18 *vidyāsthānas* contains several of the above names, viz., *sāṁkhya*, *yoga*, and *vaiśika*, but neither *vaiśeṣika* nor *nyāya* (*Mahāvvyutpatti* CCXVII, p. 327-28).

(vii) Śāṅkara uses the word “Yoga” to refer to Patañjali’s philosophy while commenting on *Brahmasūtra* 2.1.3, as we have seen. It would be interesting to know how earlier commentators on the *Brahmasūtra* interpreted this particular sūtra.

No commentators older than Śāṅkara’s have been preserved. However, Oberhammer (1978) has brought to light some citations in Sudarśanasūri’s *Śrutaparakāśikā*, a commentary on Rāmānuja’s *Śrībhāṣya* on the *Brahmasūtra*. These citations, Oberhammer argues, belong to a certain Bhāṣyakāra (so called in Yāmunamuni’s *Āgamaprāmāṇya*), whose Bhāṣya was known to, and depended upon by, Śāṅkara.

The citations discussed by Oberhammer are not connected with *Brahmasūtra* 2.1.3. They belong to sūtras 2.2.42-45. But one of them contains an enumeration of schools, among which Yoga is mentioned. This passage reads (Oberhammer, 1978: 229n):

[314]

*anye tv evaṃ varṇayanti: pūrvādhikaraṇeṣu vādināṃ tarkāvaṣṭambhāḥ  
śiṣṭāparigrhītabāhyāgamāś ca nirastāḥ / atra śiṣṭāparigrhītāḥ  
sāṁkhyayogapāśupatapañcarātrāgamāś catvāraḥ parīkṣyante ...*

Oberhammer (1978: 228) translates:

“Another (teacher) however says: In the previous chapters (of the *Brahmasūtras*) the rational arguments of the teachers and the traditions outside (the Vedic lore), which are not followed by the learned (*śiṣṭāparigrhīta*), have been refuted. Here (in this chapter) the four traditions of Sāṁkhya, Yoga, Pāśupata and Pāñcarātra which are accepted by the learned, are (to be) examined ...”

What is meant by “Here (in this chapter)” (*atra*) can be learned from Rāmānuja, who says with respect to this remark of the anonymous Bhāṣyakāra (II, p. 701; see Oberhammer, 1978: 228):

*Yat tu paraiḥ sūtracatuṣṭayaṃ kasyacid viruddhāśasya prāmānyaniṣedhaparaṃ  
vyākhyātam, tat sūtrākṣarānanuṅgaṃ sūtrakārābhiprāyaviruddhaṃ ca*

“The explanation of other (people) that the four sūtras [*Brahmasūtras* 2.2.42-45 = 2.2.39-42 in the edition of the *Śrībhāṣya*; J.B.] have as their subject-matter the refutation of the credibility of that portion of a tradition, which contradicts (the Veda), does not agree with the wording of the sūtras and is opposed to the intention of the Sūtrakāra.” (tr. Oberhammer)

It is puzzling that, apparently, the mysterious Bhāṣyakāra considered *Brahmasūtra* 2.2.42-45 to be an examination of Sāṃkhya, Yoga, Pāśupata and Pāñcarātra, where Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja are in agreement that these sūtras deal only with Pāñcarātra. Even more puzzling is that Śaṅkara and Rāmānuja agree that *Brahmasūtra* 2.2.1-10 deals with Sāṃkhya. This is puzzling because *Brahmasūtra* 2.2.1-10 must be considered to belong to “the previous chapters (of the Brahmasūtras)”, where “the rational arguments of the teachers and the traditions outside (the Vedic lore), which are not followed by the learned, have been refuted”. This shows that it is not impossible that Yoga here is the same as Vaiśeṣika, even though the latter has been refuted in *Brahmasūtra* 2.2.11-17. Alternatively, the word “Yoga” may here refer to the spiritual discipline which is known by that name, or even to Patañjali’s philosophy. I know of no evidence that would decide which choice to make.

[315]

So none of the occurrences of the word “Yoga” in the early literature compel us to believe that there was a separate Yoga system of philosophy. Such a system also fails to appear in any of the early descriptions of schools. It is absent from Bhavya’s *Madhyamakahr̥daya* (Gokhale, 1958: 165n) and Haribhadra’s *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya*. The *Prapañcahr̥daya* does not mention a Yoga system in its chapter on philosophy (Chapter 7: *jñānaprakaraṇa*), even though its final, and longest, chapter is devoted to Yoga, the spiritual discipline. Śāntarakṣita’s *Tattvasaṅgraha*, together with Kamalaśīla’s commentary *Pañjikā* thereon, though providing information about a variety of schools of thought, keep silence about the Yoga system.<sup>8</sup>

Going back further in time, we come to the *Mahābhārata*. Here it suffices to quote Edgerton’s (1924: 38) conclusion of a study dedicated to the meaning of “Yoga”: “... Yoga is ... not a ‘system’ of belief or of metaphysics. It is always a way, a method, of getting something, usually salvation ...”

It took the word “Yoga” a long time to gain currency as a synonym of “Patañjali’s philosophy”. Udayana (*Nyāyakusumāñjali* 1.3, p. 3) prefers to speak of “Patañjali’s

<sup>8</sup> The *Pañjikā* to verse 40 (p. 47, l. 3) speaks about *kāpīlayogin* “Yogins who are followers of Kapila”. This merely confirms that Yoga was not considered a philosophy. Whenever the *Tattvasaṅgraha* and its commentary talk about Yoga or Yogins, the spiritual practice and its followers are meant.

philosophy” as does Sāyaṇamādhava in his *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*.<sup>9</sup> The *Sarvasiddhāntasaṅgraha* of Śaṅkarācārya (different from the author of the *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*) speaks of “Patañjali’s point of view” (*patañjali...pakṣa*). Mādhavasarasvatī’s *Sarvadarśanakaumudī*, however, uses “Yoga” to denote this philosophy. Another example is Vijñānabhikṣu’s *Sāṃkhyapravācanabhāṣya* (p. 2, l. 25; p. 3, l. 9).

## SEŚVARA SĀMKHYA

The distinction between Sāmkhya with God (*seśvara*) and without God (*nirīśvara*) is made in some works, among them Haribhadra’s *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya*, Śāntarakṣita’s *Tattvasaṅgraha* together with Kamalaśīla’s *Pañjikā* thereon. This last pair of works (both dating from the 8<sup>th</sup> century A.D.) gives a sketchy description of the contents of Sāmkhya with God. Verses 94–100 of the *Tattvasaṅgraha* tell us that here God is the cause of creation when connected with *rajas*, the cause of the continued existence of the world when in contact with manifested *sattva*, of its dissolution when connected with manifested *tamas*. These views are embodied in the introductory verse of Bāṇa’s *Kādambarī*, quoted by Kamalaśīla: “A bow to the unborn one, who controls creation, continued existence and destruction, consists of the three [316] Vedas, and is the essence of the three genetic constituents, who is joined with *rajas* at the birth of created beings, resides in *sattva* during their continued existence [and] comes in contact with *tamas* during their dissolution”<sup>10</sup> (*Pañjikā* p. 76, l. 10-11: *rajojuṣe janmani sattvavṛttaye sthitau prajānāṃ pralaye tamaḥsprṣe / ajāya sargasthitināśatantriṇe*<sup>11</sup> *trayīmayāya triguṇātmane namaḥ //*).

It may not be possible to determine with complete certainty which school, or sect, was meant by Śāntarakṣita and Kamalaśīla. The *Ahīrbudhnya-Saṃhitā* of the Pāñcarātras has a passage (Chapter 6, verses 52-60; I, p. 57, l. 10 - p. 59, l. 3) which speaks of *sattva* as being supervised by Aniruddha as Viṣṇu, *rajas* by Aniruddha as Brahman, *tamas* by Aniruddha as Rudra.<sup>12</sup> Since Brahman, Viṣṇu and Rudra are the gods of creation, preservation and destruction respectively, this passage of the *Ahīrbudhnya-Saṃhitā* seems to fit the description of Sāmkhya-with-God in the *Tattvasaṅgraha* and the *Pañjikā*. Certain is that the *Yogabhāṣya* does not fit the description. The *Yogabhāṣya* speaks no word about God’s role in the creation, preservation and destruction of the world. Its commentaries do, but not in the way described

<sup>9</sup> See however note 2 above.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Māgha’s *Śiśupālavadha* 14.61: *padmabhūr iti srjañ jagad rajaḥ sattvam acyuta iti sthitiṃ nayan / saṃharan hara iti śrītas tamas traidham eṣa bhajati tribhir guṇaiḥ //*

<sup>11</sup> The *Kādambarī* reads -*nāśahetave*.

<sup>12</sup> *sattvaṃ tatra laghu svacchaṃ guṇarūpam anāmayaṃ // prathamam vyajyate kālān manavo ‘vatarany atah / āniruddhī tato mūrtiḥ svasaṃkalpapracoditā // adhiṣṭhātī tat sattvaṃ viṣṇunāṃnaiva nāmahāk / tad etat sakalaṃ svacchaṃ sukham āsīd anākulam // antaḥsthāmanukaṃ sattvaṃ antaḥsthācidguṇam mune / viṣṇunādhiṣṭhitaṃ tasmād viṣṇusaṃkalpacoditāt // rajo nāma guṇaḥ sattvāt tasmād āvirbhavaty alam / manavo ‘vataranty atra sattvāt saṃkalpacoditāḥ // brāhmī mūrtir guṇaṃ taṃ cāpy āniruddhy adhiṣṭhātī / tad etat pracalaṃ dukkhaṃ rajaḥ śāśvatpravṛttimat // lolībhūtam idaṃ tac ca viśvam antaḥsthitaṃ tadā / brahmaṇādhiṣṭhītāt tasmād antaḥsthāmanukān mune // saṃkalpacoditaṃ viṣṇos tamo nāma guṇo ‘bhavat / manavo ‘vataranty atra te sudarśanacoditāḥ / rudro nāma guṇas taṃ cāpy āniruddhy adhiṣṭhātī / guru viṣṭambhanaṃ śāśvan mohanaṃ cāpravṛttimat // tat tamo nāma bhāṇitaṃ guṇasāgarapāragaiḥ //*

here.<sup>13</sup> The absence of a creator God in the *Yogabhāṣya* seems to indicate that Patañjali's philosophy should be deemed *nirīśvara sām̐khya* "Sām̐khya without God" in the sense of the *Tattvasaṅgraha*; see Bronkhorst, 1983: §3.

Patañjali's philosophy is called "Sām̐khya with God", e.g., in Sāyaṇamādhava's *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* and in the *Sarvasiddhāntasaṅgraha*.

If the above expositions are correct, we must conclude that there never was a separate Yoga philosophy. This is saying more than that the "Yoga philosophy" is closely related with Sām̐khya, or even an old school of the latter. It entails that the early history of the Yoga school of Sām̐khya cannot be written, not because there is not sufficient material available, as Frauwallner (1953: 476-77) maintains, but simply because it has no early history and can have none.

It appears that the term "Yoga" came to be applied to one form of the Sām̐khya philosophy owing to Śaṅkara's incorrect understanding of some Brahmasūtras (perhaps already misunderstood by his predecessor(s)). This form of Sām̐khya was on a par with the Sām̐khya of the commentaries on the *Sām̐khyakārikā* in that it accepted the existence of God, but did not consider Him Creator God (cf. Bronkhorst, 1983). Both were *nirīśvara* [317] "without God" in the sense of the *Tattvasaṅgraha* and its commentary *Pañjikā*. The closest approximation to what we know about the *seśvara sām̐khya* "Sām̐khya with God" from the *Tattvasaṅgraha* and *Pañjikā* seems to be found among the Pāñcarātras.

It seems justified in conclusion to repeat Frauwallner's (1953: 408-09) observation that the spiritual discipline Yoga does not belong to any particular philosophical system, but may, or may not, get connected with a variety of philosophies, depending on the circumstances.

---

<sup>13</sup> See note 1, above.



[318]

## REFERENCES

- Ahīrbudhnyā-Saṃhitā*. Edited by M. D. Rāmānujācārya, under the supervision of F. Otto Schrader. 2 Volumes. Madras: Adyar Library. 1916.
- Bhāskara. *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*. Edited by Vinḍhyeshvarī Prasāda Dvivedin. Benares: Chowkhambā. 1903-1915. (Chowkhambā Sanskrit Series, Nos. 70, 185, 209.)
- Brahmasūtra* with *Śāṅkarabhāṣya*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. 1964. (Works of Śāṅkarācārya, vol. III.)
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1983). "God in Sāṃkhya." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 27, 149-164.
- Chattōpādhyāya, K. (1927). "A peculiar meaning of 'Yoga'." *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, 854-58.
- Edgerton, Franklin (1924). "The meaning of Sāṅkhya and Yoga." *American Journal of Philology* 45, 1-46.
- Frauwallner, Erich (1953). *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie*. I. Band. Salzburg: Otto Müller Verlag.
- Gokhale, V. V. (1958). "The Vedānta-philosophy described by Bhavya in his *Madhyamakahrdaya*." *Indo-Iranian Journal* 2, 165-90.
- [319]
- Hacker, Paul (1958). "Ānvīksikī." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 2, 54-83.
- Hacker, Paul (1968/69). "Śāṅkara der Yogin und Śāṅkara der Advaitin: Einige Beobachtungen." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 12-13 (Festschrift Erich Frauwallner), 119-48.
- Haribhadra. *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya*. Edited, with Guṇaratna's commentary *Tarkarāhasyadīpikā*, by Luigi Sualì. Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal (New Series Nos. 1128, 1151, 1401.) 1905-14.
- Jacobi, Hermann (1911). "Zur Frühgeschichte der indischen Philosophie." *Sitzungsberichte der Kgl. Preussischen Akademie d. Wissenschaften* (1911), 732-43. Reprinted: *Kleine Schriften*. Teil 2. Pp. 547-58. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1970.
- Jacobi, Hermann (1929). "Über das ursprüngliche Yogasystem." *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie d. Wissenschaften*. Phil.-hist. Kl. Pp. 581-624. Reprinted: *Kleine Schriften*. Teil 2. Pp. 682-725.
- Jhā, Gaṅgānātha. Translator (1924). *Kumārila Bhatta: Tantravārttika*. 2 volumes. Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal. (Bibliotheca Indica. Work No. 161.)
- Kauṇḍinya. *Pañcārthabhāṣya*. Edited, with the Pāśupata sūtras, by R. Ananthakrishna Sastri. Trivandrum: The Oriental Manuscripts Library of the University of Travancore. 1940. (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, No. CXLIII. Sri Chitrodayamanjari, No. XXXII. University Series, No. I.)
- Kauṭilya. *Arthasāstra*. Edited by R. P. Kangle. Part I. Bombay: University of Bombay. 1960. (University of Bombay Studies: Sanskrit, Prakrit and Pali. No. 1.)
- Kumārila. *Tantravārttika*. Edited by Gangādhara Śāstrī. Benares. 1903. (Benares Sanskrit Series.)
- Kunjūni Raja, K. (1960). "On the date of Śāṅkarācārya and Allied Problems." *ALB* 24, 125-48.
- Lalitavistara*. Edited by P. L. Vaidya. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute. 1958. (Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, No. 1.)
- Mādhavasarasvatī. *Sarvadarśanakaumudī*. Edited by K. Sāmbaśiva Śāstrī. Trivandrum: Government Press. 1938. (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, No. CXXXV, Śrī Citrodayamanjari, No. XXIV.)
- Māgha. *Śīśupālavadha*. Edited, with the commentary *Sarvaṃkaśā* of Mallinātha, by Durgāprasād and Śivadatta. Third Edition. Revised by Vāsudev Lakshman Śāstrī Paṅśīkar. Bombay: Nirṇaya-sāgara Press. 1902.
- Mahāvvyūtpatti*. Edited by R. Sākaki. Kyoto, 1918.
- Matilal, Bimal Krishna (1977). *Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika*. Vol. VI, Fasc. 2 (pp. 53-126) of: *A History of Indian Literature*. Edited by Jan Gonda. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

- Modi, P. M. (1936). "Meanings of 'Smṛti' in the Brahmasūtras." *Indian Historical Quarterly* 12, 714-19.
- Modi, P. M. (1947). "Defects of the Traditional Method of Interpreting the Brahmasūtras." *Proceedings of the All-India Oriental Conference* 12 (1943-4), Part III, 361-69.
- Modi, P. M. (1960). "Refutation of the Sāmkhya theory of Creation in Brahmasūtra II.2.1-10." *Gujarat Research Society Journal* 12, 336-42.
- Oberhammer, Gerhard (1978). "An Unknown Source in Śaṅkara's Refutation of the Pāñcarātra." *ABORI* 58-59 (1977-78; Diamond Jubilee Volume), 221-33.
- Prapañcahrdaya*. Edited by T. Gaṇapati Sāstrī. Trivandrum: Travancore Government Press. 1915. (Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, No. XLV.)
- Rāmānuja. *Śrībhāṣya*. Edited by R. D. Karmarkar. Parts I-III. Poona: University of Poona. 195-64. (University of Poona Sanskrit and Prakrit Series, Volume I.)
- Rüping, Klaus. 1977. *Studien zur Frühgeschichte der Vedānta-Philosophie*. Teil I. Philologische Untersuchungen zu den Brahmasūtra-Kommentaren des Śaṅkara und [320] des Bhāskara. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner. (Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien, herausgegeben vom Seminar für Kultur und Geschichte Indiens and der Universität Hamburg.)
- Śaṅkara. *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya*. See *Brahmasūtra*.
- Śaṅkara. *Pātañjalayogaśāstravivarāṇa*. Edited (under the wrong title *Pātañjalayogasūtrabhāṣyavivarāṇa*) by Polakam Sri Rama Sastri and S. R. Krishnamurthi Sastri. Madras: Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, 1952.
- Śaṅkarācārya. *Sarvadarśanasiddhāntasaṅgraha*. Edited and translated, under the title *Sarvasiddhānta-saṅgraha*, by M. Raṅgācārya. Madras: Government Press, 1909.
- Śāntarakṣita. *Tattvasaṅgraha*. Edited, with the commentary *Pañjikā* of Kamalaśīla, by Dwarikadas Shastri. 2 volumes. Varanasi: Bauddha Bharati. 1968. (Bauddha Bharati Series 1-2.)
- Sāyaṇamādhava. *Sarvadarśanasamgraha*. Edited, with an original commentary in Sanskrit, by Vasudev Shastri Abhyankar. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1924.
- Schultz, Friedrich August (1958). *Die philosophisch-theologischen Lehren des Pāsupata-Systems nach dem Pañcārthabhāṣya und der Ratnaṭikā*. Walldorf-Hessen: Verlag für Orientkunde Dr. H. Vorndran.
- Thomas, F. W. Translator (1960). *The Flower-Spray of the Quodammodo Doctrine. Śrī Malliṣeṇasūri Syād-Vāda-Maṅjarī*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag. (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung, Veröffentlichung Nr. 46.)
- Thrasher, Allen Wright (1979). "The dates of Maṇḍana Mīśra and Śaṅkara." *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 23, 117-39.
- Trautmann, Thomas R. (1971). *Kautilya and the Arthaśāstra*. A statistical investigation of the authorship and evolution of the text. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Udayana. *Nyāyakusumāñjali*. Edited and translated by E. B. Cowell, assisted by Paṇḍita Maheśa Chandra Nyāyaratna. Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press, 1864.
- Ui, H. (1917). *The Vaiśeṣika Philosophy according to the Daśapadārtha-Śāstra*. Chinese text with introduction, translation, and notes. Edited by F. W. Thomas. London: Royal Asiatic Society.
- Vātsyāyana. *Nyāyabhāṣya*. Edited, with Gautama's *Nyāyasūtra* and Viśvanātha Bhaṭṭācārya's *Vṛtti*, by Digambaraśāstrin Joṣī. Poona: Ānandāśrama. 1922. (Ānandāśramasamskr̥tagranthāvali, No. 91.)
- Vetter, Tilmann (1979). *Studien zur Lehre und Entwicklung Śaṅkaras*. Wien. 1979. (Publications of the De Nobili Research Library, Volume VI.)
- Vijñānabhikṣu. *Sāmkhyapravacanabhāṣya*. Edited by Richard Garbe. Harvard University. 1895. (Harvard Oriental Series, Volume II.)
- Williams, R. (1963). *Jaina Yoga*. A survey of the mediaeval śrāvakācāras. London: Oxford University Press.
- Woods, James Haughton. Translator (1914). *The Yoga-System of Patañjali*. Third Edition. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1966.